

# Minimum entropy production principle from a dynamical fluctuation law

Christian Maes<sup>1</sup>

Instituut voor Theoretische Fysica, K.U.Leuven

and

Karel Netočný<sup>2</sup>

Institute of Physics AS CR, Prague

**Abstract:** The minimum entropy production principle provides an approximative variational characterization of close-to-equilibrium stationary states, both for macroscopic systems and for stochastic models. Analyzing the fluctuations of the empirical distribution of occupation times for a class of Markov processes, we identify the entropy production as the large deviation rate function, up to leading order when expanding around a detailed balance dynamics. In that way, the minimum entropy production principle is recognized as a consequence of the structure of dynamical fluctuations, and its approximate character gets an explanation. We also discuss the subtlety emerging when applying the principle to systems whose degrees of freedom change sign under kinematical time-reversal.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Over the last century many attempts have been made to give a variational characterization of nonequilibrium conditions. The motivation was often found in the successes of variational methods in mechanics and in equilibrium statistical thermodynamics. Many so called *ab initio* methods in solid state physics have a variational character. For nonequilibrium purposes the best known but also widely criticized variational principle, that of the minimum entropy production principle (MinEP), goes back to the work of Ilya Prigogine, [18]. In the present paper we will restrict us to the version of the MinEP for Markov processes as was first described and proven by Klein and Meijer for some specific Markov models, see also [10, 5, 15].

As has been clear since a long time, the MinEP is only valid in some approximation. Without doubt, one restriction is that the system must be close to equilibrium, allowing only for a small breaking of the detailed balance condition; that is often referred to as the regime of irreversible thermodynamics. Yet, the situation is more subtle and there have appeared examples in the literature violating the MinEP even close to equilibrium, [8, 9]. The situation is even more complicated and downright controversial when dealing with examples

---

<sup>1</sup>email: [Christian.Maes@fys.kuleuven.be](mailto:Christian.Maes@fys.kuleuven.be)

<sup>2</sup>email: [netocny@fzu.cz](mailto:netocny@fzu.cz)

of macroscopic physics, where both positions and velocities mix and things appear to depend on the level of coarse graining.

At any rate and because of the enormous advantages of variational characterizations, there has been a continued interest in the nature of Prigogine's MinEP. It remains therefore very interesting to see if the principle can be understood, not only by direct verification as was done in [10, 5, 15], but also from the context of fluctuation theory. After all, also in equilibrium statistical physics there is an intimate relation between the variational principle characterizing equilibrium and the structure of equilibrium fluctuations. The very reason why thermodynamic equilibrium is characterized by maximum entropy or, depending on the context, by minimum Helmholtz or Gibbs free energy, is exactly because these thermodynamic potentials also appear as rate functions in the exponents governing equilibrium probabilities.

We show in this paper that a relation exists between the MinEP and the structure of steady state fluctuations for Markov processes. Our main finding is that the entropy production naturally emerges when analyzing the fluctuations of occupation times, first studied in the general context of the theory of large deviations by Donsker and Varadhan [4]. We show that in the close-to-equilibrium regime and when the state variable is even under time-reversal, the Donsker-Varadhan (DV-) functional coincides to leading order with the entropy production rate. When the state variables are odd under time-reversal, such as for the electric current in the famous counter example of [8, 9], that affine relation between entropy production and the DV-functional is no longer valid. It remains of course generally true that the variational principle associated with the DV-functional is a valid generalization of the MinEP. Yet, a useful scheme for the computation of the DV-functional for processes far from equilibrium remains an open problem.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we present a brief introduction to the large deviation theory of occupation times. In the mathematical details we often restrict ourselves to the case of continuous time and irreducible Markov processes on a finite state space. Many of the arguments have however a larger validity. For example, for a detailed balanced dynamics the DV-functional can be computed explicitly; we review that result in Section 3 with a new proof that is not restricted to finite state spaces.

Our main result follows from a perturbative evaluation of the DV-functional close to equilibrium and is contained in Section 4, first on a formal and general level and then rigorously for finite state space. In Section 5 we explain how and when the leading order of the DV-functional is related to the physical entropy production. That relation is formulated in our main Theorem 5.1.

We end with a variety of remarks and conclusions in Section 7. In particular, we briefly explain there the situation for Landauer's counterexample, [8, 9].

## 2. LARGE DEVIATIONS FOR THE OCCUPATION TIMES

Suppose that  $(X_t)_{t \geq 0}$  is a stationary ergodic Markov process. For most of what follows, we do not need to specify whether it is a jump process or a diffusion process, and on what space. Yet, it is sufficiently instructive and mathematically non trivial to keep in mind a Markov process on a finite space which is irreducible. We are interested in the fraction of time that  $X_t$  spends in some set  $A$  of states. Formally, we define the empirical distribution  $p_T$  as

$$p_T(A) = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T dt \delta_{X_t \in A} \quad (2.1)$$

( $\delta_{X_t \in A} = 1$  if  $X_t \in A$  and zero otherwise.) As we assume a unique stationary measure  $\rho$ , we have that almost surely  $p_T(A) \rightarrow \rho(A)$  as  $T \uparrow +\infty$ , by ergodicity. Yet there are fluctuations around that average and we can ask how big they are. That is a subject in the theory of large deviations and the answer is given by the asymptotic formula

$$\mathbf{P}^T[p_T \simeq \mu] \simeq \exp[-TI(\mu)]$$

that has to be understood in a logarithmic sense after taking the limit  $T \uparrow \infty$ . The rate function  $I$  has been found by Donsker and Varadhan [4, 2, 3] in the form

$$I(\mu) = \sup_{g > 0} - \left\langle \frac{Lg}{g} \right\rangle_\mu \quad (2.2)$$

where  $L$  is the generator of the Markov process and  $\langle \cdot \rangle_\mu$  denotes the expectation under the measure  $\mu$ . For a finite state space  $\Omega$ ,

$$Lg(x) = \sum_{y \in \Omega} k(x, y)[g(y) - g(x)], \quad x \in \Omega$$

where  $k(x, y) \geq 0$  is the rate for the transition  $x \rightarrow y$ .

The Donsker-Varadhan (DV-)functional is always nonnegative,  $I(\mu) \geq 0$ , and the equality takes place if and only if  $\mu = \rho$  is the invariant measure. For the precise mathematical formulation we refer to [2, 3, 4].

In general, the DV-functional (2.2) is not so simple to compute explicitly, the main problem of course being to find the maximizer  $g$ . An important case where the solution has been known and is explicit is a reversible (or detailed balance) dynamics. These basic facts are reviewed in the next section; our formulation is slightly more general than those provided by the standard references [4, 3]. The rest of the paper

is then devoted to identifying the leading term in the DV-functional for a dynamics breaking the detailed balance.

### 3. DETAILED BALANCE DYNAMICS

Suppose that for any pair of real-valued functions  $\phi$  and  $\psi$ ,

$$\langle \phi(x_0) \psi(x_\tau) \rangle_\rho = \langle \phi(x_\tau) \psi(x_0) \rangle_\rho \quad (3.1)$$

where  $\langle \cdot \rangle_\rho$  is the expectation under the stationary Markov process. The corresponding symmetry of the generator can be obtained under

$$\lim_{\tau \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\tau} \langle \phi(x_0) [\psi(x_\tau) - \psi(x_0)] \rangle_\rho = \langle \phi L \psi \rangle_\rho$$

**Theorem 3.1.** *Under condition (3.1), the DV-functional is*

$$I(\mu) = -\langle \sqrt{f} L \sqrt{f} \rangle_\rho \quad (3.2)$$

where  $f = \frac{d\mu}{d\rho}$  is the density of  $\mu$  with respect to the reversible measure  $\rho$ .

*Remark 3.2.* One recognizes the Dirichlet form  $\mathcal{D}(g, g) = -\langle g L g \rangle_\rho$  which is related to the spectral gap by

$$\Delta = \inf_{g: \langle g \rangle_\rho = 0} \frac{\mathcal{D}(g, g)}{\langle g^2 \rangle_\rho} \quad (3.3)$$

As a consequence, one has the bound

$$\begin{aligned} I(\mu) &= \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{f}, \sqrt{f}) = \mathcal{D}(\sqrt{f} - \langle \sqrt{f} \rangle_\rho, \sqrt{f} - \langle \sqrt{f} \rangle_\rho) \\ &\geq \Delta[\langle f \rangle_\rho - \langle \sqrt{f} \rangle_\rho^2] = \Delta[1 - \langle \sqrt{f} \rangle_\rho^2] \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

*Proof.* A standard proof for finite state space can be found e.g. in [3]. Here we present a new variant of that argument that works for a general (detailed balanced) Markov process.

From (2.2),

$$\begin{aligned} I(\mu) &= \sup_{g>0} \lim_{\tau \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\tau} \left[ 1 - \left\langle \frac{e^{\tau L} g}{g} \right\rangle_\mu \right] \\ &= \sup_{g>0} \lim_{\tau \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\tau} \left[ 1 - \left\langle \frac{f(x_0) g(x_\tau)}{g(x_0)} \right\rangle_\rho \right] \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Using reversibility (3.1) we subsequently get

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\langle \frac{f(x_0)g(x_\tau)}{g(x_0)} \right\rangle_\rho &= \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \frac{f(x_0)g(x_\tau)}{g(x_0)} + \frac{f(x_\tau)g(x_0)}{g(x_\tau)} \right\rangle_\rho \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \left( \sqrt{\frac{f(x_0)g(x_\tau)}{g(x_0)}} - \sqrt{\frac{f(x_\tau)g(x_0)}{g(x_\tau)}} \right)^2 \right\rangle_\rho \\
&\quad + \left\langle \sqrt{f(x_0)f(x_\tau)} \right\rangle_\rho \\
&\geq \left\langle \sqrt{f(x_0)f(x_\tau)} \right\rangle_\rho \\
&= \left\langle \sqrt{f} e^{\tau L} \sqrt{f} \right\rangle_\rho
\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

which is an optimal lower bound since the equality is attained if (and only if for an irreducible dynamics)  $g \propto \sqrt{f}$ . Hence,

$$I(\mu) = \lim_{\tau \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\tau} [1 - \langle \sqrt{f} e^{\tau L} \sqrt{f} \rangle_\rho] = -\langle \sqrt{f} L \sqrt{f} \rangle_\rho \tag{3.7}$$

as claimed.  $\square$

#### 4. PERTURBATIVE EVALUATION OF THE DV-FUNCTIONAL

**4.1. Formal derivation.** Fix a reference detailed balance dynamics with generator  $L_0$  and with reference measure  $\rho^0$ , as in Section 3. For a measure  $\mu$  we write  $f = \frac{d\mu}{d\rho^0}$  for its density with respect to  $\rho^0$ . A simple computation gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta \left\langle \frac{f}{g} L g \right\rangle_{\rho^0} &= \left\langle -\frac{f}{g^2} \delta g L g + \frac{f}{g} L \delta g \right\rangle_{\rho^0} \\
&= \left\langle \left( -\frac{f}{g^2} L g + L^+ \frac{f}{g} \right) \delta g \right\rangle_{\rho^0}
\end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

where the adjoint  $L^+$  is defined by

$$\langle \phi L \psi \rangle_{\rho^0} = \langle \psi L^+ \phi \rangle_{\rho^0} \tag{4.2}$$

on real functions. Hence, searching for the maximizer  $g^*$  of (2.2) normalized to  $\langle g^* \rangle_{\rho^0} = 1$ , we need to solve the equation

$$\frac{f}{g^{*2}} L g^* = L^+ \frac{f}{g^*} \tag{4.3}$$

Note that for  $L = L_0 = L_0^+$  that equation has a solution  $g^* = \sqrt{f} / \langle \sqrt{f} \rangle_{\rho^0}$ , in agreement with the conclusions of Section 3.

Next, for a close to equilibrium dynamics and for small fluctuations we expand  $L$ ,  $f$ , and  $g$  in power series,

$$L^\epsilon = L_0 + \epsilon L_1 + \epsilon^2 L_2 + \dots \tag{4.4}$$

$$f^\epsilon = 1 + \epsilon f_1 + \epsilon^2 f_2 + \dots \tag{4.5}$$

$$g^\epsilon = 1 + \epsilon g_1 + \epsilon^2 g_2 + \dots \tag{4.6}$$

and solve (4.3) perturbatively. Up to order  $\epsilon$  it yields

$$2L_0g_1^* = L_0f_1 + L_1^+1 \quad (4.7)$$

which is to be solved under the normalization constraint  $\langle g_1^* \rangle_{\rho^0} = 0$ . That can be achieved as follows. Writing  $\frac{d\rho^\epsilon}{d\rho^0} = h^\epsilon$  for the density of the (presumably unique for small  $\epsilon$ ) stationary measure under  $L^\epsilon$  with respect to the reference reversible measure, the stationary equation  $\rho^\epsilon L^\epsilon = 0$  can be equivalently written as  $(L^\epsilon)^+ h^\epsilon = 0$ . Expanding again  $h^\epsilon = 1 + \epsilon h_1 + \dots$ , we find that  $h_1$  verifies

$$L_0 h_1 = -L_1^+ 1 \quad (4.8)$$

and, by definition,  $\langle h_1 \rangle_{\rho^0} = 0$ . As a consequence,  $g_1^* = (f_1 - h_1)/2$  is a solution of (4.7). Provided that  $g^*$  is in fact a global maximum, the DV-functional (2.2) becomes, up to leading order,

$$\begin{aligned} I^\epsilon(\mu^\epsilon) &= -\frac{\epsilon^2}{4} \langle f_1 L_0 f_1 - h_1 L_0 h_1 + 2L_1 f_1 - 2L_1 h_1 \rangle_{\rho^0} + o(\epsilon^2) \\ &= -\left\langle \sqrt{\frac{f^\epsilon}{h^\epsilon}} L^\epsilon \sqrt{\frac{f^\epsilon}{h^\epsilon}} \right\rangle_{\rho^0} + o(\epsilon^2) \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

The functional  $I^\epsilon$  itself obviously also depends on  $\epsilon$  as from (4.4); we are dealing with a dynamics close to a reference reversible dynamics. Observe that, since  $f^\epsilon d\rho^\epsilon = h^\epsilon d\mu^\epsilon$ , the leading term in the DV-functional (4.9) (always for small deviations from equilibrium) resembles the DV-functional (3.2) for the case of detailed balance. In (4.9) that leading term is now of order  $\epsilon^2$ .

**4.2. Rigorous result.** The above formal perturbative argument can be justified on a mathematically precise level. In the present section we refine the above reasoning by restricting ourselves to the framework of continuous time Markov dynamics with a finite state space. Note that many of the standard nonequilibrium examples of stochastic lattice gases or interacting particle systems on a finite graph are thus included [5, 12, 20]. Observe also that some precision or justification is indeed needed, as one can otherwise construct counter examples to the results that will follow. Other “infinite” or “continuous” models including diffusion processes, still require additional estimates for a proper mathematical treatment, that we are not giving here though; we will comment on one important example in Section 7. On the whole and perhaps surprisingly, even only to first order around equilibrium, a general and mathematically precise identification of the DV-functional does not appear easy.

We fix a finite state space  $\Omega$ , which will serve as vertex set for irreducible directed graphs respectively with rates  $k^0(x, y) \geq 0$  (reference detailed balance) and with rates  $k^\epsilon(x, y) \geq 0$  (perturbation) between the states  $x \rightarrow y$ . We assume the reference rates  $k^0(x, y)$  define an

ergodic Markov process with the stationary distribution  $\rho^0 > 0$  and such that  $\rho^0(x)k^0(x, y) = \rho^0(y)k^0(y, x)$ , sufficient for the reversibility in (3.1). The perturbed rates  $k^\epsilon(x, y)$  defined for  $|\epsilon| \leq \epsilon_0$  with some  $\epsilon_0 > 0$ , are assumed to be a smooth modification of the  $k^0(x, y)$ . For small enough  $\epsilon$  the perturbed dynamics is hence ergodic too, with a unique invariant distribution  $\rho^\epsilon > 0$  which is a smooth modification of  $\rho^0$ .

The modified dynamics has the generator

$$L^\epsilon g(x) = \sum_{x, y \neq x} k^\epsilon(x, y)[g(y) - g(x)] \quad (4.10)$$

We further denote

$$M_{+1} = \{g > 0; \langle g \rangle_{\rho^0} = 1\}, \quad M_{+1}^\delta = \{g \in M_{+1}; g(x) \geq \delta, x \in \Omega\}$$

and we consider the functional

$$J_f^\epsilon(g) = \sum_{x, y \neq x} \rho^0(x) f(x) k^\epsilon(x, y) \left[1 - \frac{g(y)}{g(x)}\right] \quad (4.11)$$

for  $f \in M_{+1}^\delta$  on  $g \in M_{+1}$ .

**Proposition 4.1.** *Suppose that  $f \in M_{+1}^\delta$  for some  $\delta > 0$ . For all sufficiently small  $|\epsilon|$ , the functional  $J_f^\epsilon$  has a unique maximizer  $g^{*\epsilon}(f)$  in  $M_{+1}$ , and  $g^{*\epsilon}(f) \xrightarrow{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \sqrt{f} / \langle \sqrt{f} \rangle_{\rho^0}$ , uniformly in  $M_{+1}^\delta$ .*

**Theorem 4.2.** *If  $\mu^\epsilon$  is a smooth deformation of  $\mu^0 = \rho^0$ , then the DV-functional  $I^\epsilon(\mu^\epsilon)$  has a Taylor expansion in  $\epsilon$  around  $\epsilon = 0$ , with leading term*

$$I^\epsilon(\mu^\epsilon) = - \left\langle \sqrt{\frac{d\mu^\epsilon}{d\rho^\epsilon}} L^\epsilon \sqrt{\frac{d\mu^\epsilon}{d\rho^\epsilon}} \right\rangle_{\rho^0} + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (4.12)$$

The proofs are postponed to Section 6.

## 5. RELATION WITH ENTROPY PRODUCTION

We proceed with the *physical* interpretation of the formula (4.12) for the DV-functional. It will turn out that (4.12) equals the excess of entropy production with respect to the stationary entropy production. Clearly, to explain, we need some physical context for the dynamics itself. However in order to avoid relying solely on concrete examples, we can start from the quite general observation that the physical entropy production as a variable on path-space is measuring the breaking of time-reversal symmetry. That has been argued for at various places, see e.g. [15, 13] and references therein. When the distribution at time zero is given by  $\mu$ , then the entropy production over the time interval

$[0, \tau]$ , is just the relative entropy of the path-space distribution  $\mathbf{P}_\mu^\tau$  with respect to its time-reversal:

$$\dot{S}^\tau(\mu) = \left\langle \log \frac{d\mathbf{P}_\mu^\tau}{d\mathbf{P}_{\mu_\tau}^\tau \Theta} \right\rangle_\mu \quad (5.1)$$

where  $(\Theta\omega)_t = \omega_{\tau-t}$  is the time reversal of the trajectory  $\omega$  and  $\mu_\tau$  is the evolved distribution at time  $\tau$ , i.e., the solution of the Master equation  $\frac{d\mu_t}{dt} = \mu_t L$ ,  $\mu_0 = \mu$ . Since the process is Markovian, the mean entropy production can be written as  $\dot{S}^\tau(\mu) = \int_0^\tau \sigma(\mu_t) dt$  where

$$\sigma(\mu) = \lim_{\tau \downarrow 0} \frac{\dot{S}^\tau(\mu)}{\tau} \quad (5.2)$$

is the mean entropy production rate. Taken as a functional on distributions  $\mu$ , (5.2) is the crucial quantity to be discussed in the present section. In particular we can evaluate it under the same conditions as for Theorem 4.2. It means that we evaluate the entropy production rate in  $\mu^\epsilon$  and that we have a dynamics that is close to equilibrium, indicated by changing the notation  $\sigma$  to  $\sigma^\epsilon$ . The main result of the paper is then summarized in the following general and remarkable relation:

**Theorem 5.1.** *Under the conditions of Theorem 4.2,*

$$I^\epsilon(\mu^\epsilon) = \frac{1}{4}[\sigma^\epsilon(\mu^\epsilon) - \sigma^\epsilon(\rho^\epsilon)] + o(\epsilon^2)$$

Before we give the proof of that Theorem, we briefly remind the reader of the physical context of entropy production, at least within the limited set-up of Markov jump processes. We refer to [19, 17, 5, 15, 10] for additional material.

**5.1. Entropy production in Markov jump processes.** For the Markov jump processes of Section 4.2 the entropy production rate (5.2) becomes

$$\sigma(\mu) = \sum_{x, y \neq x} \mu(x) k(x, y) \log \frac{\mu(x) k(x, y)}{\mu(y) k(y, x)} \quad (5.3)$$

In the case of detailed balance,  $\rho(x) k(x, y) = \rho(y) k(y, x)$ , it is easily verified that  $\sigma(\mu)$  is the time derivative of the relative entropy:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(\mu) &= \sum_x \log \frac{\mu(x)}{\rho(x)} \sum_{y \neq x} [\mu(x) k(x, y) - \mu(y) \rho(y, x)] \\ &= - \sum_x \log \frac{\mu(x)}{\rho(x)} \left. \frac{d\mu_t(x)}{dt} \right|_{t=0} \\ &= - \frac{d}{dt} S(\mu_t | \rho) \Big|_{t=0}, \quad S(\mu | \rho) = \sum_x \mu(x) \log \frac{\mu(x)}{\rho(x)} \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$



When there is a driving away from equilibrium, there is some mean entropy production even in the stationary regime. To be specific, assume that each state  $x$  is given an energy  $E(x)$  and that the transition  $x \leftrightarrow y$  is possible thanks to the interaction with a heat reservoir at inverse temperature  $\beta(x, y) = \beta(y, x)$ . The rates are taken to satisfy the local detailed balance condition

$$\frac{k(x, y)}{k(y, x)} = e^{\beta(x, y)[E(x) - E(y)]} \quad (5.5)$$

For a motivation, see [5, 15]. As a reference we have the Boltzmann-Gibbs distribution  $\rho(x) \propto e^{-\beta E(x)}$  with  $\beta$  some reference inverse temperature.

Entropy production rate (5.3) can be split into a contribution which is associated to the system and can be written as the time derivative of some entropy function, and a part measuring the change of entropy in the environment, i.e.,

$$\sigma(\mu) = \sigma_S(\mu) + \sigma_R(\mu)$$

For the system part we take, compare with (5.4),

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_S(\mu) &= \sum_{x, y \neq x} \mu(x) k(x, y) \log \frac{\mu(x) \rho(y)}{\mu(y) \rho(x)} \\ &= -\frac{d}{dt} S(\mu_t | \rho) \big|_{t=0} \\ &= \frac{d}{dt} [S(\mu_t) - \beta \langle E \rangle_{\mu_t}] \big|_{t=0} \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

with  $S(\mu) = -\sum_x \mu(x) \log \mu(x)$  the Shannon entropy and  $\langle E \rangle_\mu = \sum_x \mu(x) E(x)$  the mean energy. Hence,  $\sigma_S(\mu)$  is recognized as  $(-\beta$  times) the rate of change in the free energy.

The environment part is then

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_R(\mu) &= \sum_{x, y \neq x} \mu(x) k(x, y) \log \frac{\rho(x) k(x, y)}{\rho(y) k(y, x)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x, y \neq x} [\beta(x, y) - \beta] [E(x) - E(y)] [\mu(x) k(x, y) - \mu(y) k(y, x)] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x, y \neq x} [\beta(x, y) - \beta] \langle J_E(x, y) \rangle_\mu \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

where  $\langle J_E(x, y) \rangle_\mu = \langle J_E(y, x) \rangle_\mu$  is the mean energy transfer, or heat, to the reservoir associated with the transitions  $x \leftrightarrow y$ . In other words,  $\sigma_R(\mu)$  is the change of entropy in the environment plus the term

$$\beta \sum_x E(x) [\mu(x) k(x, y) - \mu(y) k(y, x)] = \beta \frac{d}{dt} \langle E \rangle_{\mu_t} \big|_{t=0}$$

which is just the counter term we have subtracted from the system part (5.6).

**5.2. Proof of Theorem 5.1.** Following our general strategy, we compute (5.2) by a perturbation expansion around a reference detailed balanced dynamics. Again, the expansion is mathematically fully justified for a finite state space, at least under the conditions of the theorem.

We split the entropy production rate similarly as in the previous section, taking now the invariant distribution  $\rho^0$  corresponding to  $\epsilon = 0$  as the reference: starting from (5.2),

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma(\mu) &= \lim_{\tau \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\tau} \left\langle \log \frac{d\mu}{d\rho^0}(\omega_0) - \log \frac{d\mu_\tau}{d\rho^0}(\omega_\tau) + \log \frac{d\mathbf{P}_{\rho^0}^\tau}{d\mathbf{P}_{\rho^0}^\tau \Theta} \right\rangle_\mu \\ &= \lim_{\tau \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\tau} \left[ \left\langle \log \frac{d\mu}{d\rho^0} \right\rangle_\mu - \left\langle \log \frac{d\mu_\tau}{d\rho^0} \right\rangle_{\mu_\tau} \right] + \lim_{\tau \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\tau} \left\langle \log \frac{d\mathbf{P}_{\rho^0}^\tau}{d\mathbf{P}_{\rho^0}^\tau \Theta} \right\rangle_\mu\end{aligned}\quad (5.8)$$

The first term is the limit

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_S(\mu) &= \lim_{\tau \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\tau} \left[ \left\langle \log \frac{d\mu}{d\rho^0} \right\rangle_\mu - \left\langle \log \frac{d\mu}{d\rho^0} \right\rangle_{\mu_\tau} - \left\langle \frac{d\mu_\tau}{d\mu} \log \frac{d\mu_\tau}{d\mu} \right\rangle_\mu \right] \\ &= -\langle L \log f \rangle_\mu - \left\langle \frac{d\mu L}{d\mu} \right\rangle_\mu \\ &= -\langle L \log f \rangle_\mu\end{aligned}\quad (5.9)$$

Expanding both  $\mu \equiv \mu^\epsilon$  and  $L \equiv L^\epsilon$  as in (4.4)–(4.5), we get

$$\sigma_S^\epsilon(\mu^\epsilon) = -\langle f^\epsilon L^\epsilon \log f^\epsilon \rangle_{\rho^0} = -\epsilon^2 \langle f_1 L_0 f_1 + L_1 f_1 \rangle_{\rho^0} + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (5.10)$$

Similarly, for the second term in (5.8), now denoted by  $\sigma_R^\epsilon$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_R^\epsilon(\mu^\epsilon) &= \lim_{\tau \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\tau} \left\langle \log \frac{d\mathbf{P}_{\rho^0}^{\tau, \epsilon}}{d\mathbf{P}_{\rho^0}^{\tau, 0}}(\omega) - \log \frac{d\mathbf{P}_{\rho^0}^{\tau, \epsilon}}{d\mathbf{P}_{\rho^0}^{\tau, 0}}(\theta\omega) \right\rangle_{\mu^\epsilon}^\epsilon \\ &= \lim_{\tau \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\tau} \left\langle \frac{d\mu^\epsilon}{d\rho^0}(\omega_0) \frac{d\mathbf{P}_{\rho^0}^{\tau, \epsilon}}{d\mathbf{P}_{\rho^0}^{\tau, 0}}(\omega) \left\{ \frac{d\mathbf{P}_{\rho^0}^{\tau, \epsilon}}{d\mathbf{P}_{\rho^0}^{\tau, 0}}(\omega) - \frac{d\mathbf{P}_{\rho^0}^{\tau, \epsilon}}{d\mathbf{P}_{\rho^0}^{\tau, 0}}(\Theta\omega) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho^0}^0 + o(\epsilon^2) \\ &= \lim_{\tau \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{\tau} \left\langle \frac{d\mathbf{P}_{\rho^0}^{\tau, \epsilon}}{d\mathbf{P}_{\rho^0}^{\tau, 0}}(\omega) \left\{ \frac{d\mu^\epsilon}{d\rho^0}(\omega_0) - \frac{d\mu^\epsilon}{d\rho^0}(\omega_\tau) \right\} \right\rangle_{\rho^0}^0 \\ &\quad + \lim_{\tau \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{2\tau} \left\langle \left\{ \frac{d\mathbf{P}_{\rho^0}^{\tau, \epsilon}}{d\mathbf{P}_{\rho^0}^{\tau, 0}}(\omega) - \frac{d\mathbf{P}_{\rho^0}^{\tau, \epsilon}}{d\mathbf{P}_{\rho^0}^{\tau, 0}}(\Theta\omega) \right\}^2 \right\rangle_{\rho^0}^0 + o(\epsilon^2) \\ &= -\langle L^\epsilon f^\epsilon \rangle_{\rho^0} + \Delta^\epsilon + o(\epsilon^2) \\ &= -\epsilon^2 \langle L_1 f_1 \rangle_{\rho^0} + \Delta^\epsilon + o(\epsilon^2)\end{aligned}\quad (5.11)$$

where  $\mathbf{P}_{\rho^0}^{\tau, 0}$  and  $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\rho^0}^0$  refer to the path-space distribution under the reference detailed balance dynamics ( $\epsilon = 0$ ) started from  $\rho^0$ . The term

$\Delta^\epsilon$  is simply independent of  $f^\epsilon$ . All in all we have found, up to leading order,

$$\sigma^\epsilon(\mu^\epsilon) = -\epsilon^2 \langle f_1 L_0 f_1 + 2L_1 f_1 \rangle_{\rho^0} + \Delta^\epsilon + o(\epsilon^2) \quad (5.12)$$

Comparing with the result (4.9) or (4.12) finishes the proof.

## 6. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4.1 AND OF THEOREM 4.2

Let  $0 < \delta < 1$  be given and fix  $\mu$  by giving  $f = \frac{d\mu}{d\rho^0} \in M_{+1}^\delta$ . In order to localize the maximizer  $g^{*\epsilon}(f)$  of the functional  $J_f^\epsilon$ , we decompose the set  $M_{+1}$  as follows. Given  $\alpha, \beta > 0$  such that  $\alpha + \beta < \sqrt{\delta}$  we introduce

$$N_{+1}^\alpha(\mu) = \left\{ g \in M_{+1}; \left| g(x) - \frac{\sqrt{f(x)}}{\langle \sqrt{f} \rangle_{\rho^0}} \right| < \alpha, x \in \Omega \right\} \quad (6.1)$$

Obviously,  $N_{+1}^\alpha(\mu) \subset M_{+1}^\beta$ , and writing  $[M_{+1}^\beta]^c = M_{+1} \setminus M_{+1}^\beta$  we have the disjoint decomposition

$$M_{+1} = N_{+1}^\alpha(\mu) \cup [M_{+1}^\beta \setminus N_{+1}^\alpha(\mu)] \cup [M_{+1}^\beta]^c \quad (6.2)$$

In what follows we are going to prove that, choosing  $\epsilon, \alpha, \beta$  small enough, the functional  $J_f^\epsilon$  takes its maximum inside  $N_{+1}^\alpha(\mu)$ , and that is unique by a local convexity argument.

We start with a lemma that follows immediately from the assumptions. Recall that the state space is assumed finite; let  $|\Omega| = N$ .

**Lemma 6.1.** *There is an irreducible graph  $G$  with vertex set  $\Omega$  and for which over all edges  $(x, y)$ ,  $\rho^0(x)k^0(x, y) \geq \gamma$  for some  $\gamma > 0$ . Moreover,  $k^\epsilon(x, y) \geq \frac{1}{2}k^0(x, y)$  for all sufficiently small  $|\epsilon| > 0$ .*

The next lemma states that when  $g$  is outside  $M_{+1}^\beta$ , then  $J_f^\epsilon(g)$  can be made very negative ( $\beta \downarrow 0$ ).

**Lemma 6.2.** *For all sufficiently small  $|\epsilon|$  and for all  $g \in [M_{+1}^\beta]^c$ ,*

$$J_f^\epsilon(g) \leq C - \frac{1}{2}\gamma\delta\beta^{-\frac{1}{N-1}} \quad (6.3)$$

with  $C$  a constant independent of  $f, g$  and  $\epsilon$ .

*Proof.* From the previous lemma,

$$\begin{aligned} J_f^\epsilon(g) &= \sum_{x, y \neq x} \rho^0(x) f(x) k^\epsilon(x, y) \left[ 1 - \frac{g(y)}{g(x)} \right] \\ &\leq \max_x \sum_{y \neq x} k^\epsilon(x, y) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(x, y) \in G} \rho^0(x) k^0(x, y) \left[ \frac{f(x)g(y)}{g(x)} + \frac{f(y)g(x)}{g(y)} \right] \\ &\leq C - \frac{1}{2}\gamma\delta \sum_{(x, y) \in G} \left[ \frac{g(y)}{g(x)} + \frac{g(x)}{g(y)} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (6.4)$$

for a suitable  $C$  and  $\epsilon$  small enough. Since  $g \in [M_{+1}^\beta]^c$ , there is  $\bar{x} \in \Omega$  such that  $g(\bar{x}) < \beta$ . Hence there exists a pair  $(x, y) \in G$  such that either  $g(y) \geq \beta^{-\frac{1}{N-1}}g(x)$  or  $g(x) \geq \beta^{-\frac{1}{N-1}}g(y)$ . To see that, assume this is not true and denote by  $l(x)$  the length of the shortest path in  $G$  connecting  $\bar{x}$  and  $x$ . Then, using  $l(x) \leq N - 1$ ,

$$\langle g \rangle_{\rho^0} \leq \max_x g(x) \leq g(\bar{x}) \max_x \beta^{-\frac{l(x)}{N-1}} \leq \beta^{-1}g(\bar{x}) < 1 \quad (6.5)$$

which is a contradiction.  $\square$

Now comes the statement that the maximum is also outside  $M_{+1}^\beta \setminus N_{+1}^\alpha(\mu)$ .

Use the shorthand  $g_0 = \sqrt{f}/\langle \sqrt{f} \rangle_{\rho^0}$ .

**Lemma 6.3.** *For all sufficiently small  $|\epsilon| > 0$  we have  $J_f^\epsilon(g) < J_f^\epsilon(g_0)$  whenever  $g \in M_{+1}^\beta \setminus N_{+1}^\alpha(\mu)$ .*

*Proof.* As clear from the proof of Theorem 3.1,  $g_0$  is the unique maximizer of  $J_f^0$  in  $M_{+1}$  due to the irreducibility assumption. Using that  $M_{+1}^\beta \setminus N_{+1}^\alpha(\mu)$  is a compact set (in the Euclidean metric, say),

$$\sup_{g \in M_{+1}^\beta \setminus N_{+1}^\alpha(\mu)} J_f^0(g) < J_f^0(g_0) \quad (6.6)$$

By the continuity of  $J_f^\epsilon(g)$  at  $\epsilon = 0$  which is uniform in  $g \in M_{+1}^\beta$ , we can choose  $|\epsilon| > 0$  sufficiently small so that (6.6) extends to

$$\sup_{g \in M_{+1}^\beta \setminus N_{+1}^\alpha(\mu)} J_f^\epsilon(g) < J_f^\epsilon(g_0) \quad (6.7)$$

Hence, the lemma follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.4.** *There is  $\alpha > 0$  such that for all sufficiently small  $|\epsilon| > 0$ ,  $J_f^\epsilon$  is a strictly concave function in  $N_{+1}^\alpha(\mu)$ .*

*Proof.* For any  $\psi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , a direct computation yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \Big|_{t=0} J_f^0(g_0 + t\psi) &= - \sum_{x, y \neq x} \rho^0(x) k^0(x, y) \\ &\quad \times \left[ \psi(x) \left( \frac{f(y)}{f(x)} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} - \psi(y) \left( \frac{f(x)}{f(y)} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \right]^2 \end{aligned} \quad (6.8)$$

Since the term in the square bracket is strictly positive unless  $\psi(x)/\psi(y) = \sqrt{f(x)/f(y)}$ , and using Lemma 6.1, the right-hand side in (6.8) is strictly negative unless  $\psi \propto \sqrt{f}$ . In particular, it implies  $d^2 J_f^0(g_0 + t\psi)/dt^2(t=0)$  is a strictly negative quadratic form on the linear subspace defined by  $\langle \psi \rangle_{\rho^0} = 0$ .

By continuity, it first extends to the strict negativity of the quadratic form  $d^2 J_f^0(g + t\psi)/dt^2(t=0)$  on the same linear subspace and for all  $g \in N_{+1}^\alpha(\mu)$  with some  $\alpha > 0$ . Finally, it implies the strict negativity

of  $d^2 J_f^\epsilon(g + t\psi)/dt^2(t=0)$  on  $\langle\psi\rangle_{\rho^0} = 0$  for all  $g \in N_{+1}^\alpha(\mu)$  and for all sufficiently small  $|\epsilon| > 0$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 4.2.* Pick some  $\alpha > 0$  such that Lemma 6.4 holds, and fix  $\beta > 0$  to satisfy  $J_\mu^\epsilon(g_0) > C - \frac{1}{2}\gamma\delta\beta^{-\frac{1}{N-1}}$  for all  $|\epsilon| > 0$  small enough. Then by Lemmata 6.2-6.3, the maximizer of  $J_\mu^\epsilon$  exists and is localized in  $N_{+1}^\alpha$ ; moreover it is unique by Lemma 6.4. As the  $\alpha$  can be chosen arbitrarily small (and observe that  $\alpha \downarrow 0$  drives  $\epsilon \downarrow 0$ ), one also has  $g^{*\epsilon}(\mu) \xrightarrow{\epsilon \downarrow 0} g_0$ .

If  $k^\epsilon(x, y)$ ,  $x \neq y \in \Omega$ , are all differentiable then the maximizer  $g^{*\epsilon}$  coincides with a solution of (4.3) in the domain  $N_{+1}^\alpha$ ; recall the latter necessarily exists and is unique. The perturbative calculation in Section 4.1 then follows by an application of the inverse mapping theorem.  $\square$

## 7. CONCLUSIONS: MINIMUM ENTROPY PRODUCTION PRINCIPLE

**7.1. Summary.** Our analysis goes beyond merely checking MinEP; rather, it enables to view it as a consequence of a dynamical variant of the Einstein's formula for equilibrium fluctuations. In simple terms, Theorem (5.1) reads that the probability for the empirical distribution  $p_T$  to coincide with some  $\mu^\epsilon = \rho^\epsilon + O(\epsilon)$ , has the following generic structure:

$$\mathbf{P}^{T,\epsilon}(p_T \simeq \mu^\epsilon) \propto e^{-\frac{T}{4}[\sigma^\epsilon(\mu^\epsilon) + o(\epsilon^2)] + o(T)} \quad (7.1)$$

By ergodicity, the maximal probability is obtained for  $p_T = \rho^\epsilon$ . According to the above it is also obtained by minimizing the entropy production. Hence, the minimum entropy production principle emerges as an immediate consequence of the structure of dynamical fluctuations. Moreover, its approximate status is also understood since the relation between the entropy production and the true DV-functional is restricted to the leading order of expansion around equilibrium. A systematic perturbation expansion of  $I^\epsilon(\mu^\epsilon)$  would provide corrections to that principle; we will not discuss that issue now. Some further remarks end the paper:

### 7.2. Remarks.

- (1) What has been said so far about the entropy production is subject to one further *physical* condition: that the Markov process describes the dynamics of time-reversal symmetric variables. Only then are (5.2) or (5.3) correct expressions for the entropy production rate. Yet, certain observables like e.g. momentum or magnetic field have the property that even a closed system dynamics cannot be expected detailed balanced in the sense of (3.1). Instead, a symmetry under time-reversal can only be seen when also the sign of these, so called time-reversal odd

observables is changed. A deeper reason why such a generalization is needed is that the fundamental equations of motion are often second order in time. For processes on variables that are odd under time-reversal the above analysis needs a modification (see also the next remark).

- (2) We give an example of a Gaussian Markov diffusion process  $(X_t)$ . Suppose a Langevin dynamics of the form

$$dX_t = (\mathcal{E} - \gamma X_t) dt + \sqrt{\frac{2\gamma}{\beta}} dW_t \quad (7.2)$$

with standard Wiener process  $W_t$ . The force  $\mathcal{E}$  is constant and  $\gamma > 0$  is some friction coefficient. For scalar  $X_t \in \mathbb{R}$  the process is detailed balanced in the sense of (3.1) with respect to  $\rho(dx) \propto \exp[-\frac{\beta}{2}(x - \frac{\mathcal{E}}{\gamma})^2] dx$ , a Gibbs distribution for inverse temperature  $\beta$ . From Theorem 3.1 one easily computes the corresponding DV-functional to be

$$I(\mu) = \frac{\gamma}{4\beta} \left\langle \frac{(f')^2}{f} \right\rangle_\rho, \quad f = \frac{d\mu}{d\rho} \quad (7.3)$$

Is that equal to the entropy production? It now depends on whether  $X_t$  is even or odd under time-reversal.

Assume first that  $X_t$  models the position of an overdamped oscillator. That is an even variable and the detailed balance (3.1) is verified; the stationary process is in equilibrium. The entropy production is found most easily from (5.4):

$$\sigma(\mu) = -\frac{d}{dt} S(\mu_t | \rho)|_{t=0} = \frac{\gamma}{\beta} \left\langle \frac{(f')^2}{f} \right\rangle_\rho \quad (7.4)$$

Hence, we get  $\sigma(\mu) = I(\mu)/4$ , consistent with our general result.

Alternatively, suppose now that  $X_t \equiv V_t$  is instead the fluctuating velocity of a Langevin particle dragged by force  $\mathcal{E}$ . Although (3.1) remains valid, it no longer expresses time-reversal invariance since the kinematical time-reversal (changing the sign of the velocity) is not applied. Furthermore, if  $\mathcal{E} \neq 0$ , then  $\langle \phi(v_0) \psi(v_\tau) \rangle_\rho \neq \langle \phi(-v_\tau) \psi(-v_0) \rangle_\rho$  breaking even a (generalized) reversibility. In particular, there is for  $\mathcal{E} \neq 0$  a nonzero stationary entropy production. That mean entropy production can be obtained by the methods of Reference [16] in the form

$$\sigma(\mu) = \frac{\gamma}{\beta} \left\langle \frac{1}{f} \left( f' + \frac{\beta \mathcal{E}}{\gamma} f \right)^2 \right\rangle_\rho \quad (7.5)$$

and is different from (7.4). Using that  $\langle f' \rangle_\rho = \beta \langle v - \frac{\mathcal{E}}{\gamma} \rangle_\mu$  and  $\sigma(\rho) = \beta \mathcal{E}^2 / \gamma$ , we obtain the following modification of Theorem 5.1:

$$I(\mu) = \frac{1}{4} [\sigma(\mu) + \sigma(\rho) - 2\beta \mathcal{E} \langle v \rangle_\mu] \quad (7.6)$$

In particular, the stationary distribution is now found as a minimizer of the functional  $\sigma(\mu) - 2\beta \mathcal{E} \langle v \rangle_\mu$ . Equivalently, since  $\sigma(\rho) = \beta \mathcal{E} \langle v \rangle_\rho$ , the stationary measure is now characterized by a (constrained) *maximum* entropy production principle:

$$\max_{\mu} \{ \sigma(\mu) \mid \sigma(\mu) = \beta \mathcal{E} \langle v \rangle_\mu \} = \sigma(\rho) \quad (7.7)$$

- (3) The above also provides an explanation for the counter example to MinEP given by Landauer, [8, 9]. There one considers an electrical circuit with resistance  $R$ , inductance  $L$ , and voltage source  $\mathcal{E}$  in series. The physical entropy production is  $\hat{\sigma}(j) = \beta R j^2$ , corresponding to the Joule heat caused by the current  $j$  through the resistance  $R$ . Apparently, the stationary current  $j^* = \mathcal{E}/R$  does not coincide with the minimum of the entropy production.

To understand the situation, we embed the network dynamics in a stochastic process by combining Kirchhoff's second law with the Johnson-Nyquist noise voltage on the resistance to get the equation

$$dj_t = \frac{1}{L} (\mathcal{E} - Rj_t) dt + \sqrt{\frac{2R}{\beta L^2}} dW_t \quad (7.8)$$

(the Nyquist prefactor for the noise being determined from the fluctuation-dissipation relation). That is a linear Langevin equation of the form (7.2) for the current which is odd under time-reversal. Hence, the conclusion of the previous remark applies and, in particular, both Theorem 5.1 and MinEP are no longer valid. Yet, we can obtain the correct variational principle from the DV-functional.

Consider indeed the functional

$$\bar{I}(\bar{j}) = \inf_{\mu} \{ I(\mu) \mid \langle j \rangle_\mu = \bar{j} \} \quad (7.9)$$

which, by the contraction principle, is the large deviation rate function for the empirical average  $j_T = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T j_t dt$  as  $T \uparrow +\infty$ ,

$$\mathbf{P}[j_T \simeq \bar{j}] \propto \exp[-T \bar{I}(\bar{j})] \quad (7.10)$$

Here it is easy to compute from (7.3):

$$\bar{I}(\bar{j}) = \frac{\beta R}{4} \left( \bar{j} - \frac{\mathcal{E}}{R} \right)^2 \quad (7.11)$$

and that is then also the corrected variational functional to consider.

For other examples and for further details we refer to [1].

- (4) Our result as formulated in Theorem 5.1 is no longer valid if we are away from the perturbation regime and the assumptions are not verified. As an example, consider again a Markov dynamics on a finite state space  $\Omega$  and let  $\mu$  be a distribution supported in some  $\Omega_0 \subsetneq \Omega$ , i.e.,  $\mu(x) = 0$  for all  $x \in \Omega \setminus \Omega_0$ . As one immediately checks from (5.3),  $\sigma(\mu) = +\infty$  whenever there are some  $x \in \Omega_0$ ,  $y \in \Omega \setminus \Omega_0$  such that  $\mu(x)k(x, y) \neq 0$ . On the other hand, the DV-functional is bounded:  $I(\mu) \leq \max_x \sum_{y \neq x} k(x, y)$ .
- (5) The Donsker-Varadhan theory is not restricted to the time-averages in the sense of (2.1). More generally, one can study fluctuations along a discrete sequence of observations with a time interval  $\tau$  between the observations. The time-averages are then of the form

$$\frac{\tau}{T} (F(X_\tau) + F(X_{2\tau}) + \dots + F(X_{T-\tau}) + F(X_T))$$

and we are concerned with their large deviations along the limit  $T = n\tau \uparrow +\infty$ . For every  $\tau$  there is a rate function  $I_\tau(\mu)$ . The case (2.2) corresponds to  $\lim_{\tau \downarrow 0} I_\tau(\mu)/\tau = I(\mu)$ . Obviously, one can investigate the close-to-equilibrium behavior for every one of these cases and, in principle, one obtains for each of them a variational principle.

## Acknowledgment

K. N. is grateful to the Instituut voor Theoretische Fysica, K. U. Leuven for kind hospitality, and acknowledges the support from the project AVOZ10100520 in the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic.

## REFERENCES

- [1] S. Bruers, C. Maes, and K. Netočný. On the validity of entropy production principles for linear electrical circuits. *In preparation*.
- [2] A. Dembo and O. Zeitouni. *Large Deviation Techniques and Applications*. Jones and Barlett Publishers, Boston (1993).
- [3] F. den Hollander. *Large Deviations*. Field Institute Monographs, Providence, Rhode Island (2000).
- [4] M. D. Donsker and S. R. Varadhan. Asymptotic evaluation of certain Markov process expectations for large time, I. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **28**:1–47 (1975).
- [5] G. Eyink, J. L. Lebowitz, and H. Spohn. Microscopic origin of hydrodynamic behavior: entropy production and the steady state. *Chaos, Soviet-American Perspectives in Nonlinear Science*, Ed. D. Campbell, p. 367–391 (1990).
- [6] S. R. de Groot and P. Mazur. *Non-equilibrium Thermodynamics*. North Holland Publishing Company (1969).



- [7] E. T. Jaynes. The minimum entropy production principle. *Ann. Rev. Phys. Chem.*, **31**:579–601 (1980).
- [8] R. Landauer. Inadequacy of entropy and entropy derivatives in characterizing the steady state. *Phys. Rev. A*, **12**:636–638 (1975)
- [9] R. Landauer. Stability and entropy production in electrical circuits. *J. Stat. Phys.*, **13**:1–16 (1975).
- [10] M. J. Klein and P. H. E. Meijer. Principle of minimum entropy production. *Phys. Rev.*, **96**:250–255 (1954).
- [11] R. Kubo, K. Matsuo and K. Kitahara. Fluctuation and Relaxation of Macrovariables. *J. Stat. Phys.*, **9**:51–95 (1973).
- [12] T. M. Liggett. *Interacting Particle Systems*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York (1985).
- [13] C. Maes. On the origin and the use of fluctuation relations for the entropy. *Séminaire Poincaré*, **2**:29–62, Eds. J. Dalibard, B. Duplantier, and V. Rivasseau. Birkhäuser, Basel (2003).
- [14] C. Maes and K. Netočný. Static and dynamical nonequilibrium fluctuations. *Preprint* (2006).
- [15] C. Maes and K. Netočný. Time-reversal and entropy. *J. Stat. Phys.*, **110**:269–310 (2003).
- [16] C. Maes, K. Netočný, and M. Verschuere. Heat conduction networks. *J. Stat. Phys.*, **111**:1219–1244 (2003).
- [17] C. Maes, F. Redig, and A. Van Moffaert. On the definition of entropy production via examples. *J. Math. Phys.*, **41**:1528–1554 (2000).
- [18] I. Prigogine. *Introduction to Non-Equilibrium Thermodynamics*. Wiley-Interscience, New York (1962).
- [19] Da-Quan Jiang, Min Qian, Ming-Ping Qian. *Mathematical Theory of Nonequilibrium Steady States*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics 833, Springer (2004).
- [20] H. Spohn. *Large Scale Dynamics of Interacting Particles*. Springer, Heidelberg (1991).